

STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP

The present application (Application No. 10/814,951) and U.S. Patent No. 6,629,267, issued to Glerum et al. (hereinafter "Glerum"), were owned by, or under an obligation for assignment to, Microsoft Corporation at the time the invention of Application No. 10/814,591 was made.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>LLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

## REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request that the above-identified application be re-examined.

I. Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) - Statement Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)

Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,629,267, issued to Glerum et al. (hereinafter "Glerum"), in view of a publication entitled "Document Viewer Installation and Getting Started" (hereinafter "WORD"), and in further view of applicants' admitted prior art (hereinafter "AAPA"). This rejection is addressed as follows.

Applicants submit that the cited reference to Glerum is disqualified from being relied upon to support the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) because, pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(c)(1), Glerum and the present application were commonly owned by the same assignee, Microsoft Corporation, at the time the invention of the present application was made. In this regard, in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 706.02(1) and (2), applicants, via their undersigned attorney, have entered a statement of common ownership in a separately-labeled section above, entitled STATEMENT OF COMMON OWNERSHIP.

In view of the disqualification of Glerum, applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-12, and 14-18 as being obvious over Glerum in view of WORD and further in view of AAPA under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

II. Rejection of Claims 19, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

The Office Action further rejected Claim 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over a publication entitled "Internet Explorer Security Options, Part 2" by Smith (hereinafter "Smith") in view of a publication entitled "Macromedia Flash Player 5.0 Causes an Error Message in Windows XP" (hereinafter "Macromedia"), and in further view of AAPA. The

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>LLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2500  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.652.8100

Office Action further rejected Claim 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smith in view of Macromedia, further in view of AAPA, and in further view of "Microsoft Computer Dictionary," page 445 (hereinafter "REG"). The Office Action further rejected Claim 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smith (hereinafter "Smith") in view of Macromedia, further in view of AAPA, and in further view of a publication entitled "Description and Availability of Internet Explorer Error Reporting Tool" (hereinafter "Reporting Tool").

Applicants respectfully disagree and submit that Claim 19 is non-obvious over Smith in view of Macromedia and in further view of AAPA; Claim 20 is non-obvious over Smith in view of Macromedia, further in view of AAPA, and further in view of REG; and Claim 21 is not obvious over Smith in view of Macromedia, further in view of AAPA, and in further view of Reporting Tool because the prior arts fail to teach or suggest certain elements of both the independent and dependent claims, which are discussed in detail later in this response. While applicants disagree with the grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action, in order to advance the prosecution of the present application, Claim 19 has been slightly amended to clarify the claim language and to further distinguish the claim from the cited prior art.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.111, and for the reasons set forth below, applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims. Prior to discussing why applicants believe that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, a brief summary of the disclosed pending subject matter and brief summaries of the teachings of the cited references are provided. These summaries, however, are presented solely to assist the Examiner in recognizing the differences between the pending claims and the cited references, and should not be construed as limiting on the disclosed subject matter.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>TM</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

A. Summary of the Present Invention

The present invention is generally directed to improving the stability of a Web browser by identifying automatically, and without further user input, plug-in modules that cause failures, and permitting users to disable or update problematic plug-in modules. In one aspect, a method is provided for identifying a plug-in module that generated a failure. In response to receiving notice of a failure, the method obtains automatically, and without further user input, selected contents of memory from a computer created at the time of the failure. A failure signature is generated automatically, and without further user input, from the contents of memory that is characteristic of the plug-in module that generated the failure. Then, the newly created failure signature is compared automatically, and without further user input, with one or more failure signatures generated to identify the source of the failure.

B. Summary of Macromedia

The Macromedia reference is directed to a Macromedia Flash player 5.0 that causes an error message in Windows XP. When a user tries to use the Macromedia Flash player version 5.0, the user's computer may become unstable and Microsoft Internet Explorer (hereinafter "IE") may stop responding or an error message stating that IE has encountered a problem and must be shut down. If the user chooses to view the data in the error report, the error report is opened in another window for the user to view. In order to resolve the encountered problem, the user has to obtain and install the most current version of Macromedia Flash player.

C. Summary of Smith

The Smith reference is purportedly directed to configuring security settings for security zones in Microsoft Internet Explorer. In this regard, Smith discloses a way for users to define security policies while browsing a computer network. For example, from a graphical user interface, users may implement a security policy in which broad categories of plug-in modules

are either automatically disabled or enabled. Also, in the Smith system, a user may define a security policy in which a prompt is displayed to obtain user feedback before a plug-in module to a Web browser program is allowed to execute.

D. Rejection of Claim 19

Claim 19 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being obvious over Smith in view of Macromedia and in further view of AAPA. Applicants respectfully disagree. While applicants disagree with the grounds of rejection cited in the Office Action, in order to advance the prosecution of the present application, Claim 19 has been slightly amended to clarify the claim language and to further distinguish the claim from the cited prior art. As amended, Claim 19 recites:

A computer-readable medium bearing computer-executable instructions which, when executed:

identifies plug-in modules used in conjunction with a Web browser;

identifies automatically and without further user input, a plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature;

displays automatically and without further user input, a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in modules used in conjunction with a Web browser; and

supports disabling the specific plug-in module used in conjunction with the Web browser that generated the failure instead of a category of plug-in modules.

The Office Action asserts that Smith displays a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in module used in conjunction with a Web browser to read on the claim recitation "displays automatically and without further user input, a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in modules used in conjunction with a Web browser." Applicants respectfully disagree because, even though Smith teaches displaying a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in module

used in conjunction with a Web browser, Smith fails to teach that the graphical user interface is displayed automatically without further user input. Accordingly, Smith fails to teach "displays automatically and without further user input, a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in modules used in conjunction with a Web browser."

Applicants agree with the Office Action remarks that Smith fails to teach identifying or disabling a plug-in module that generated a failure. The Office Action asserts that Macromedia identifies a plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature to read on the claim recitation "identifies automatically and without further user input, a plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature." Applicants respectfully disagree because Macromedia identifies the plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature only when the user views the data in the error report; the plug-in module is not identified automatically and without further user input. Macromedia, like Smith, fails to teach "identifies automatically and without further user input, a plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature."

Accordingly, applicants respectfully submit that neither Smith nor Macromedia teach "identifies automatically and without further user input, a plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature," and "displays automatically and without further user input, a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in modules used in conjunction with a Web browser," as recited in Claim 19. Further, AAPA fails to teach or suggest the deficiencies associated with Smith and Macromedia.

Whether or not Smith, Macromedia, and AAPA are properly combined, Smith, Macromedia, and AAPA do not teach, suggest, or describe the foregoing aspects of the invention recited in Claim 19. Generally described, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), a *prima facie* case of obviousness can be established only if the cited references, alone or in combination, teach each

and every element recited in the claim. *In re Bell*, 991 F2d 781 (Fed. Cir. 1993). Smith, Macromedia, and AAPA, alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest "identifies automatically and without further user input, a plug-in module that generated a failure based on a failure signature," and "displays automatically and without further user input, a graphical user interface that lists the plug-in modules used in conjunction with a Web browser." Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with regard to Claim 19, and the allowance of Claim 19.

E. Rejection of Claims 20-21

Claims 20-21 are dependent on Claim 19. As discussed above, Smith, Macromedia, and AAPA, alone or in combination, fail to teach each and every element of independent Claim 19. Accordingly, for the above-mentioned reasons, Claim 20 is also not obvious over Smith, in view of Macromedia, further in view of AAPA, and in further of REG, and Claim 21 is also not obvious over Smith, in view of Macromedia, further in view of AAPA, and in further of Reporting Tools. Accordingly, applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the pending rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) with regard to Claims 20-21, and the allowance of Claims 20-21.

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, applicants respectfully submit that the above-identified patent application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application and allowance of the claims at an early date are solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or comments concerning this matter, he is invited to contact the undersigned at the number provided below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR  
JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>



Clint J. Feekes  
Registration No. 51,670  
Direct Dial No. 206.695.1633

CJF:jlg

LAW OFFICES OF  
CHRISTENSEN O'CONNOR JOHNSON KINDNESS<sup>PLLC</sup>  
1420 Fifth Avenue  
Suite 2800  
Seattle, Washington 98101  
206.682.8100